

Application Serial No. 10/039,999

Date August 4, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated February 4, 2005

Page 11 of 12

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that all rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney would like to thank Patent Examiners Cang Thai and Tan Nguyen for their time and courtesies extended during a personal interview conducted on this application. During the interview the Office Action and proposed claims were discussed.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 18, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1-35 specifically defines an interactive project management method which applies, involves, uses and advances the technological arts. The method includes the step of determining access of authorized individuals to the electronic collaboration center formed in the computer network for the time disjointed electronic interaction of the authorized individuals on a project through the collaboration center.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1-35 defines statutory patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-35 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1 and 18, and the claims depending respectively therefrom, defines the relationship between the method steps and where and how such method steps are implemented.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1-35 is particularly pointed out and distinctly claimed as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thackston.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1-40, and new claims 41 and 42, includes features which are not anticipated by Thackston.

Application Serial No. 10/039,999
Date August 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 4, 2005

Page 12 of 12

Thackston is devoid of any teaching of an electronic collaboration center on a computer system or network for the time disjointed electronic interaction of authorized individuals on a project. Specifically, Thackston in column 32, starting at line 51, defines a session mediator which coordinates activity among participating team members as a virtual chairperson for an interactive session. Thus, while Thackston may utilize a computer network for a virtual meaning, the interactive meeting takes place in real time among all participating members. This is the same as having a meeting where all team members are physically present in one location.


Therefore, Thackston is devoid of an electronic collaboration center on the computer network which allows authorized individuals to contribute to any element or portion of a project defined on the collaboration center in a time disjointed electronic manner.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1-42 patentably defines over Thackston and is not anticipated thereby.

Thus, claims 1-42 are submitted to be in condition for allowance; a Notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE, WOOD
& HELMHOLDT, P.C.



William M. Hanlon, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 28422
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: August 4, 2005
WMH/grl